

## कार्यालय अधिशासी अभियन्ता, निर्माण स्वण्ड पी०एम०जी०एस०वाई० लो॰नि॰वि॰,पोखरी (चमोली)

E mail- eepmgsypokhari@rediffmail.com

1028 /सिवन भूकि पत्रांक सेवा में.

दिनांक 21/8/2017

उप वन संरक्षक,

केदारनाथ वन्यजीव प्रभाग.

गोपेश्वर।

श्रीगढ़ से हनोली मोटर मार्ग पर वनभूमि हस्तान्तरण प्रस्ताव में इंगित आपत्तियों के निराकरण के विषय:-

आपका पत्र EDS dated 31-10-2016 FP/UK/ROAD/10790/2015 सन्दर्भ:-

महोदय,

उपरोक्त विषयक सन्दर्भित पत्र के कम में श्रीगढ़ से हनोली मोटर मार्ग पर वनभूमि हस्तान्तरण

क0सं0	इंगित आपत्ति	निराकरण	
1	Hard copy of the proposal provided by State Govt. contains all photocopied documents. May provide hard copy containing all original documents including recommendations of the competent authorities from Part II to V.	The hardcopy of the proposal with all original documents is being submitted to the Kedarnath DFO office , Gopeshwar.	
2	Short narrative uploaded at A.1 (iii) at Part I online does not give any information about the project except name and length.	Narrative describing the importance of the project has been entered at A.1 (iii) of part online.	
3	Period for which forest land is proposed for diversion is not mentioned at A.1 (x) Part I online	Required information has been entered at A.1 (x) part I online.	
4	In the village wise breakup of forest land proposed for diversion uploaded at B2.3 Part I online the breakup of 2.1 ha forest land is not	The required correction regarding breakup of 2.1 hectare forest land among 3 villages has been entered and corrected to 0.77 hectare at	
	provided between the 3 villages menti oned therein. Further, the village wise breakup of non forest land is adding to 0.7 ha whereas it should be 0.77 ha.	B2.3 part I online.	
5	In the geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for diversion uploaded at C (iv) Part I online the geo coordinates have been shown at very	The corrected geo-referenced digital map of the area proposed for diversion showing geo coordinates at every 200 to 300 m interval along	
	few points. Also the map is on google earth image which does not serve any useful purpose. May provide/upload scanned copy of GIS software generated geo referenced digital map	the alignment has been uploaded at C (iv) Part I online.	
	to the exact scale of the proposed road showing geo coordinates at 200 to 300 m interval along the alignment including all turning points.	Part It online cannot be accessed by user agency.	
6	Justification for locating the project of forest land uploaded at D (i) Part I online provides justification	Required Justification has been provided at D (i) Part I online.	
	for construction of this road and not the justification for locating the project of forest land.	To be upleaded by 46.0.	
7	The FRA certificate uploaded at K Part I online the area proposed for diversion is mentioned 2.87 ha which should be 2.10 ha as per the proposal.	The required FRA certificate of all the three villages has been uploaded.	
	Further, names of three villages are mentioned in the village wise breakup uploaded at B2.3 Part I online whereas the Village Level Committee (VLC) meeting proceedings under FRA have been provided only for one village. It is also observed that names of two villages i.e. Hanoli & Shrigad have been mentioned in this one VLC meeting proceeding s	्र अधिश्रमसी अभियम्सा गीर्ल्यार्व्यारम् स्वयन्त्र जीर्लार्वित प्रोस्त्रसी(समोली)	



## कार्यालय अधिशासी अभियन्ता, निर्माण स्वण्ड पी॰एम॰जी॰एस॰वाई॰ लो॰नि॰वि॰,पोस्वरी (चमोली)

E mail- eepmgsypokhari@rediffmail.com

(v) Part I & 13 (ii) Part II online is not proper as the same is provided on google earth image and only one point has been marked in hand without providing GIS software generated shape file. May provide/upload GIS software generated geo refe renced digital map of the area proposed for CA providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file.  The KML file of the CA area uploaded at L (iv) (c) Part I & 13 (i) Part II online is not correct since as per Decision Support System analysis report the area of CA this KML file is 23.86 ha which should be 4.20 ha as per proposal. May upload revised KML file for 4.2 ha CA area.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  Muck disposal plan though provided in the hard copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  Muck Disposal again at part I online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct. May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at To be uploaded.	r. man- <u>eepingsypoknari@redin</u>
(v) Part I & 13 (ii) Part II online is not proper as the same is provided on google earth image and only one point has been marked in hand without providing GIS software generated shape file. May provide/upload GIS software generated geo refe renced digital map of the area proposed for CA providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file.  The KML file of the CA area uploaded at L (iv) (c) Part I & 13 (i) Part II online is not correct since as per Decision Support System analysis report the area of CA this KML file is 23.86 ha which should be 4.20 ha as per proposal. May upload revised KML file for 4.2 ha CA area.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  The Administrative Approval of the hard copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  At serial no. 5 Part II online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such species is not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct. May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at To be uploaded.	福州南 夏5/8/2017
provide/upload GIS software generated geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for CA providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file.  The KML file of the CA area uploaded at L (iv) (c) Part I & 13 (i) Part II online is not correct since as per Decision Support System analysis report the area of CA this KML file is 23.86 ha which should be 4.20 ha as per proposal. May upload revised KML file for 4.2 ha CA area.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  Muck disposal plan though provided in the hard copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  At serial no. 5 Part II online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at To be uploaded.	geo referenced digital map of CA n uploaded at L (v) Part I online .
Part I & 13 (i) Part II online is not correct since as per Decision Support System analysis report the area of CA this KML file is 23.86 ha which should be 4.20 ha as per proposal. May upload revised KML file for 4.2 ha CA area.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  The Administrative Approval of the Competent Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  Muck disposal plan though provided in the hard copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  At serial no. 5 Part II online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at To be uploaded.	मिटर मार्च पर क्लामी हस्तान
Authority of the State Govt. for the construction of this road was issued in 2006. May certify whether it is still valid after a lapse of 9 to 10 years.  Muck disposal plan though provided in the hard copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  At serial no. 5 Part II online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct. May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at  To be uploaded.	KML file of area 4.2 hectare of the een uploaded at L (iv) (c) part I
copy, is not properly uploaded at additional document Part I online since it is not opening. May upload again.  At serial no. 5 Part II online it is mentioned that the working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at  To be uploaded	ative approval of the competent ne state govt for the construction o wrongly highlighted as 2006, but year 2009, supporting sanction n attached.
working plan is under preparation. May indicate the prescription provided under the expired working plan.  At s.no. 6 Part II online it is mentioned that the area is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at  To be uploaded	Plan has been properly uploaded online.
is slightly prone to erosion but there is no mention protective measures required in this regard.  In s.no. 8 (v) it is mentioned that there is presence of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at  To be uploaded	cannot be accessed by user agency.
of rare and endangered species in the area but the impact of road construction on such speciesis not mentioned.  In the district profile column 14 Part II online, against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct. May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at  To be uploaded	cannot be accessed by user agency.
against 1031.955 ha forest land diverted in the past the CA stipulation has been shown only 434.32 ha which does not appear to be correct.  May revise the data.  In the site inspection report of the DFO uploaded at To be uploaded.	annot be accessed by user agency.
	annot be accessed by user agency.
15 Part II online the recommendation of DFO not given and DFO recommendation also not uploaded at 16 Part II online.	d by DFO.

संलग्नः— वनभूमि हस्तान्तरण प्रस्ताव की मूल प्रति 01नं०

्र अधिश्मिसी अभियन्ता पी०एम०जी०एस०वाई० खण्ड, लो०नि०वि०,पोखरी(चमोली)